

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,491	09/17/2003	Suzanne E. Schaefer	24180-910000	4842
Stephen T. Sch	7590 07/12/2007 errer		EXAM	INER
McDermott, Will & Emery 227 West Monroe Chicago, IL 60606-5096			MIGGINS, MICHAEL C	
		,	· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3 /			1772	
	•	•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers	10/664,491	SCHAEFER ET AL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael C. Miggins	1772				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was affaire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin 17 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 18 cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Ap	oril 2007.					
	action is non-final.					
· <u> </u>						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims		,				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>34,35 and 37-40</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>34-35, 37-40</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers	,					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	e-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		d.				
	•	•				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
	-/					

DETAILED ACTION

REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN

1. There are no rejections withdrawn.

REJECTIONS REPEATED

2. All of the 102 rejections either maintained or set forth in the non-final rejection of 11/27/06, pages 2-3, paragraphs 3-5.

NEW REJECTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 34-35 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant recites the limitation of a melt index above about 10g/10min which was not recited in the original claims or specification. The original claims and specification recite the specific values of 12 and 15 for the melt index but do not provide support for the much broader range of above about 10 to infinity.

-

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

5. Applicant's arguments of 4/27/07 have been carefully considered but are deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant has argued that the citation of Kaschel (column 2, lines 28-34) with regard to the melt index of the polyethylene sealing layer is not in reference to their own invention but rather to an invention disclosed in EP 0572034 and that melt index of the polyethylene sealing layer of Kaschel is from 0.5 to 10 g/10 min (column 4, lines 45-49). However, it is clearly stated in the MPEP that a reference is for all it discloses not just the preferred embodiments (MPEP 2123). Furthermore, applicant's claim recites that the melt index is above *about* 10. The term "about" includes numbers below and above 10. Thus, a melt index of 10 g/10 min would read on applicant's claim because the phrase "above *about* 10" includes values below and above 10. Applicant alleges that none of the examples are as high as 10 g/10 min. However, claim 1 of Kaschel specifically recites a melt index of 0.5 to 10g/10 min.

Applicant argues that Kaschel does not disclose that the third layer has a higher melt index than the second layer. However, Kaschel in claim 1 recites that the third layer, the single site catalyzed layer, has a melt index as high as 10 which is much higher than any of the polymers listed in table 2.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1772

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Miggins whose telephone number is 571-272-1494. The examiner can normally be reached on 1:00-10:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Miggins Primary Examiner

MCM July 9, 2007